

at rights. He arrived safely at the Court-House; but, instead of being comforted there by the well-bred welcome of the bar, he was looked upon angrily by nearly every man, and every lawyer was disrespectful and insulting in his hearing. The *Edgfield Democrat* had announced the coming of "the carpet-bag Yankee" Judge to hold the Court, and had advised all *"un-named jurors not to come."* "Not to recognize such an unconstitutional, scatious Court." The members of the bar held a caucus, and decided not to attend the Court, but taking wit in their anger, they recommended and decided to appear. You can imagine the unpleasantry of the Judge's situation, in the trial of some of the criminal cases, the defendant's counsel, while addressing the Jury, would say something to prejudice them against the Judge, by abasing to the unconstitutionality of the Court and the disgrace of having a carpet-bag Judge to preside in the case. In every instance the Judge properly reprimanded the counsel for his impertinence, and threatened to suspend him for contempt of court. After this the lawyers, seeing that the Judge was determined to maintain the dignity of the court, and was in earnest, behaved better. Well, this illustrates the state of things in the whole of South Carolina. Edgfield is a fair sample of the State. The State is in a condition of high excitement, ready for explosion, and will explode, if Seymour is elected. But, if Grant is elected, as now seems probable, all this angry excitement will subside. The Rebels will know then that they cannot get up another rebellion, and will submit to and acquiesce in what they know will then be inevitable! They will do it reluctantly and ingenuously, it is true, but nevertheless they will submit. Much of this may surprise you, friend Kirkland, but it is all true; and should Seymour be elected, no "Yankees" can live in South Carolina, and real estate, now very low, would not, for the next ten years, sell for one-half its present low prices.

#### KU-KLUX KLAN IN SOUTH CAROLINA. LETTER TO AN EMINENT NEW-YORK PHYSICIAN —DAYLIGHT MURDERS—REMARKABLE DEMOCRATIC MEETING.

MY DEAR DOCTOR: As you requested, I write you about the state of affairs here. I find that instead of being exasperated on North, not half is told. For instance, I learn that Judge Hugo, Republican candidate for Congress for the 11th District, went to Newberry recently to speak. He was frequently disturbed, insulted, and abused, having pistols drawn upon him. He was followed through the streets to the depot by an armed mob, which threatened his life if he should dare return. On the same day, a quiet, unoffending negro, Johnson Pandy, was shot dead in open daylight, on fair open ground, without any quarrel. This murder was not committed by one in a crowd of rowdy whites, but was a practice of evidence can be obtained against the assassin. A few days ago, a very quiet, moderate, unoffending old man (white), Mr. Martin, a Republican member of the Legislature from Abbeville, was shot dead in the public road by four or five men in disguise, and no trace was left of the murderers. Here is a description of a Democratic meeting at Newberry recently, just received from \*\*\* He says: "At the great Democratic meeting here, I saw boys hardy entered upon their town with a pistol in one pocket and a bottle of whisky in the other, damning the Radicals and threatening to shoot negroes. The negroes very sensibly kept out of the way. I had never fully realized until that day what a drunken people we are, especially the young men. It is rare on such days to see one entire sober after he has been in town long enough to get drunk. I was talking to a substantial Democrat, to-day, who believes that Grant will be elected, and that the peaceable citizens will be disposed to submit. But, he says that all hell cannot control our young men and boys. They will commit outrages; the military will be sent here, and will punish the innocent and drive them to exile with the outlaws." This is a picture of the state of affairs in our place in the up-country, which is, I dare say, a fair specimen of all. I have met with a number of prominent men here from the upper counties, and they agree that *there is no assurance of safety for any man who is suspected of sympathy with the Republican party.* One very prominent man, from Greenville, tells me that he generally hears me spoken of with profound respect by sensible men, but that I could have no assurance anywhere up-country, being known as a Republican. This state of affairs is deplorable by all quiet, well-disposed persons, but they feel powerless now to prevent it. Here in Charleston, I think there is a decided反差 between the Radical and the Unionists, though only three days ago our journal threatened strongly to denounce him. Adams, I think, will do good. They hear him as a Democrat, though what he teaches is sound Republican doctrine in the main. He is to speak here to-night. Very many of the best men in this city are utterly disgusted with the Democracy, and tell men like myself that they would oppose it openly were it not for proscription and danger to their business. Materially the condition of the country is much better, as we have generally good crops.

#### THE SITUATION IN ARKANSAS.

WHOLESALE MURDER AND ROBBERY IN ARKANSAS—THE LAWS SCAFFED AND TRAMPLED UNDER FOOT—WORSHIPPING GOD ACCORDING TO SEYMOUR AND BLAIR.

(FROM A CITIZEN OF ARKANSAS.)

CAMDEN, Ark., Oct. 8.—We are waiting with bated breath the result of the State elections on next Tuesday in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Indiana, for we feel that upon the result in these States the great national contest, pregnant with such mighty interests, hinges. The enterprising and the devilish spirit engendered throughout the South by the bloody and revolutionary doctrines proclaimed in the Democratic platform, is seen by you and us in the cold-blooded assassination of Dr. J. M. Johnson of Mississippi County, the attempted assassination of Senators Wheeler and Barker, and the atrocious murder of thousands of good men, white and black, whose only crime was a toeless devotion to the principles of constitutional liberty. The Rebel press throughout the South, echoed by their Rebel allies at the North, deny the fact of so many hellish outrages being committed here, and charge that it is a mere system of Radical lying to influence your Northern elections. THE HALF HAS NOT BEEN TOLD. Hundreds—and I had almost said, thousands—of poor, unoffending black men have been tied to trees, whipped unmercifully, and murdered. The masses are threatened with robbery of the hard-earned fruits of their industry, and consequent starvation of themselves, their wives, and their little ones if they vote the "Radical ticket." As a consequence a reign of terrorism exists among them in this portion of the State, which will deter two-thirds from voting, and many, perhaps a large majority of those registered, will be compelled to vote, if they vote at all, with a party which they naturally and instinctively abhor to propitiate the good will of their employers. These are the arguments used with the blacks to create a healthy public sentiment in favor of Messrs. Seymour and Blair. Is it strange they should be effective? So much for the black loyalists, whose hearts are as true as the cause of universal liberty, embodying equal and exact justice to all. The white Unionists are scoffed at and shunned, and every mean and low device is resorted to, to cripple and ruin them. If business men or mechanics, they are visited with social ostracism. Dr. Wright, a responsible citizen of this city, and a member of the State Legislature, claimed letters of honorable withdrawal from the Methodist Episcopal Church, of which church he had long been a member; the pastor said that there were charges against him; he asked to see them, and, what oh Tribune, do you think they were? Why, that he was a Radical, and had said that he would not be a candidate for the Legislature, and, afterward ran for, and was elected to, that office. The doctor recently lost his wife, who had been a member in good standing of that church 20 years. She had been nearly 12 months preceding her death a confirmed invalid; and yet, because her husband is a Radical, she was denied, during the long, weary weeks and months of her illness, and in the hour of death, the religious consolation of the Church in which she had been reared, and to which she was truly an ornament. Yet this public-religious person could find time to conduct a two-weeks prayer-meeting, saying Divine intercession in favor of the election of Seymour and Blair. These are facts patent to every one here. I have entered into these personal details to give your readers a correct understanding of the real situation here. Even the Church is no city of refuge for them! The only fires that burn on the altars of many of our churches are political fires, and in no church do they burn fiercer than in the Methodist Episcopal Church South, to which ecclesiastical bodies belong the bad predominance of leadership in this new crusade against the sublime truths contained in the Declaration of Independence. When the fire of rebellion were kindled throughout the South, it was this Christian Church that fanned them into flames, whose lurid glow enveloped the Continent, and they are now gathering together the embers left from the great conflagration for the new bonfire promised in the event of the success of the Democracy in the approaching election. In view of these facts, we feel that the election of Seymour and Blair, and the Unionists with them, is the curse of God upon the South, and the nation. With Seymour's election we feel that the last hope of establishing a firm basis and maintaining Republican institutions throughout the South is swept out of existence. No Union of the South can be worse off than the condition of the South as it stands to-day. The people, deprived of civil and political rights, will be worn out, dispirited, and unable to continue to struggle. That Rebel vengeance, hate, and malice can suggest nothing but destruction, would relate into a condition lower than that of the beasts of the field. But we hope for better things. Maine and Vermont have spoken in no uncertain voice to-day.

AT 3 p. m. the House adjourned.

have declared fit terms not to be misinterpreted that they are not ashamed of their actions, and that their sons who went down to death in battle and of starvation have not died in vain—the living have honored their dead by their bolts, as the dead honored the nation by the sacrifice of their lives.

#### PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL GENERAL CONVENTION.

##### TWELFTH DAY.

The House met at 10 a.m. yesterday. Morning services were conducted by the Rev. Mr. Pierce of Auburn, and the Rev. Dr. Ballard of Maine. The benediction was pronounced by Bishop Kerfoot of Pennsylvania.

The minutes of Monday's proceedings were read and approved.

The Rev. Dr. Howe of Pennsylvania from the Committee on Canons, reported and moved the adoption of a resolution amending Canon 5, sec. 8, 11, in regard to the election of Bishops. The motion was carried, requiring the examination in part to be conducted by written question and answers, the manuscript to be preserved; the examination to extend through parts of the day, and the Bishop to be present. The motion was carried, that in the due course of time, in cases of examination at which he could not be present, to appoint a permanent Committee for the Diocese, or for each district thereof, to conduct the examination.

The Rev. Dr. Stables thought that this was a matter of detail, and should be left to the Bishops.

The Rev. Dr. Haight said that the examinations as usually conducted were very imperfect, and advocated the report of the Committee.

The Rev. Dr. Gowan followed on the same side, and recommended the object of preserving the MSS. of the questions and answers on the examinations, was to prevent the unfair admission or rejection of candidates, because in the particular school of Theology of the examinations.

The Rev. Dr. Godwin opposed the preservation of the records as unfair to candidates, who he said, should not be held to their crude answers given on examination.

The Rev. Dr. Clements of Ohio urged the striking out of the provision for the preservation of the MSS. as encumbering the archives.

The Rev. Dr. Hale advocated the report of the Committee.

Dr. Clark of Connecticut moved to postpone indefinitely the consideration of the Report of the Committee.

The Rev. Dr. Sheldon wished to dignify and solemnize every possible way the examination of candidates for the priesthood.

The house of 12, at which a vote was to be taken upon the selection of the next place of meeting having arrived, that subject was postponed until the Report on the examination of candidates for the ministry should be presented.

Mr. Wm. Welch of Pennsylvania advocated very earnestly the adoption of the proposed Canon, unfeared, he cause in it, and in favor of raising the standard of education among the clerical students.

For Rev. Mr. Gowan of Nebraska was opposed to the canon, and in favor of letting well-enough alone.

The Rev. Dr. Wheat of Tennessee said he had been 40 years in the ministry, and his experience told him that the examination of candidates for the ministry should be discontinued.

A Lay Deity did not like the proposed change. He said that in spite of the most strenuous efforts made in the Report that the proposed Canon, which he and others were not educated classically, and he thought the Episcopal Church had as much need of such men as had profound theologians, though they also were most essential.

The Rev. Dr. Mead of Connecticut was strongly in favor of the proposed canon. If any man had extraordinary qualifications to preach God's word, and could satisfy two Presbyters of that fact, their certificate would authorize him to go and preach.

The Rev. Dr. Clements' motion to strike out the provision for the preservation of the manuscript examinations, was lost.

The Rev. Mr. Rogers of Texas moved to amend by making the examination committee to be appointed by the Bishop consist of one presbyter, with the chaplain, instead of two presbyters, as reported by the Committee.

The question was then put upon the canon as amended, and it was adopted.

The House then proceeded to select a place for the meeting of the next General Convention. After some discussion as to the fairest way of voting upon the question, a vote was taken, and Baltimore was chosen by a vote of 12 to 12, one more than a majority.

The House then took a recess of an hour.

After recess the Rev. Dr. Haight, from the Committee on Canons, to whom we had referred the report of the Rev. Dr. Sheldon, on the examination of candidates for the priesthood, gave a report of the same, and the motion was carried.

The Rev. Dr. Stables, as the proposer of the change, desired to state the reason for it. He felt that in offering this amendment he had brought before the Convention a most important subject, one affecting the peace and welfare of the Church, and the welfare of the world.

He had, however, by his report, but if prayers were not read to him to be read in public, he would refuse to read them, and take the consequences. He would rather be tried for disobedience than for heresy.

The Rev. Dr. Rogers of Texas moved to amend by making the examination committee to be appointed by the Bishop consist of one presbyter, with the chaplain, instead of two presbyters, as reported by the Committee.

The question was then put upon the canon as amended, and it was adopted.

The House then proceeded to select a place for the meeting of the next General Convention. After some discussion as to the fairest way of voting upon the question, a vote was taken, and Baltimore was chosen by a vote of 12 to 12, one more than a majority.

The House then took a recess of an hour.

After recess the Rev. Dr. Haight, from the Committee on Canons, to whom we had referred the report of the Rev. Dr. Sheldon, on the examination of candidates for the priesthood, gave a report of the same, and the motion was carried.

The Rev. Dr. Stables, as the proposer of the change, desired to state the reason for it. He felt that in offering this amendment he had brought before the Convention a most important subject, one affecting the peace and welfare of the Church, and the welfare of the world.

He had, however, by his report, but if prayers were not read to him to be read in public, he would refuse to read them, and take the consequences. He would rather be tried for disobedience than for heresy.

The Rev. Dr. Rogers of Texas moved to amend by making the examination committee to be appointed by the Bishop consist of one presbyter, with the chaplain, instead of two presbyters, as reported by the Committee.

The question was then put upon the canon as amended, and it was adopted.

The House then proceeded to select a place for the meeting of the next General Convention. After some discussion as to the fairest way of voting upon the question, a vote was taken, and Baltimore was chosen by a vote of 12 to 12, one more than a majority.

The House then took a recess of an hour.

After recess the Rev. Dr. Haight, from the Committee on Canons, to whom we had referred the report of the Rev. Dr. Sheldon, on the examination of candidates for the priesthood, gave a report of the same, and the motion was carried.

The Rev. Dr. Stables, as the proposer of the change, desired to state the reason for it. He felt that in offering this amendment he had brought before the Convention a most important subject, one affecting the peace and welfare of the Church, and the welfare of the world.

He had, however, by his report, but if prayers were not read to him to be read in public, he would refuse to read them, and take the consequences. He would rather be tried for disobedience than for heresy.

The Rev. Dr. Rogers of Texas moved to amend by making the examination committee to be appointed by the Bishop consist of one presbyter, with the chaplain, instead of two presbyters, as reported by the Committee.

The question was then put upon the canon as amended, and it was adopted.

The House then proceeded to select a place for the meeting of the next General Convention. After some discussion as to the fairest way of voting upon the question, a vote was taken, and Baltimore was chosen by a vote of 12 to 12, one more than a majority.

The House then took a recess of an hour.

After recess the Rev. Dr. Haight, from the Committee on Canons, to whom we had referred the report of the Rev. Dr. Sheldon, on the examination of candidates for the priesthood, gave a report of the same, and the motion was carried.

The Rev. Dr. Stables, as the proposer of the change, desired to state the reason for it. He felt that in offering this amendment he had brought before the Convention a most important subject, one affecting the peace and welfare of the Church, and the welfare of the world.

He had, however, by his report, but if prayers were not read to him to be read in public, he would refuse to read them, and take the consequences. He would rather be tried for disobedience than for heresy.

The Rev. Dr. Rogers of Texas moved to amend by making the examination committee to be appointed by the Bishop consist of one presbyter, with the chaplain, instead of two presbyters, as reported by the Committee.

The question was then put upon the canon as amended, and it was adopted.

The House then proceeded to select a place for the meeting of the next General Convention. After some discussion as to the fairest way of voting upon the question, a vote was taken, and Baltimore was chosen by a vote of 12 to 12, one more than a majority.

The House then took a recess of an hour.

After recess the Rev. Dr. Haight, from the Committee on Canons, to whom we had referred the report of the Rev. Dr. Sheldon, on the examination of candidates for the priesthood, gave a report of the same, and the motion was carried.

The Rev. Dr. Stables, as the proposer of the change, desired to state the reason for it. He felt that in offering this amendment he had brought before the Convention a most important subject, one affecting the peace and welfare of the Church, and the welfare of the world.

He had, however, by his report, but if prayers were not read to him to be read in public, he would refuse to read them, and take the consequences. He would rather be tried for disobedience than for heresy.

The Rev. Dr. Rogers of Texas moved to amend by making the examination committee to be appointed by the Bishop consist of one presbyter, with the chaplain, instead of two presbyters, as reported by the Committee.

The question was then put upon the canon as amended, and it was adopted.

The House then proceeded to select a place for the meeting of the next General Convention. After some discussion as to the fairest way of voting upon the question, a vote was taken, and Baltimore was chosen by a vote of 12 to 12, one more than a majority.

The House then took a recess of an hour.

After recess the Rev. Dr. Haight, from the Committee on Canons, to whom we had referred the report of the Rev. Dr. Sheldon, on the examination of candidates for the priesthood, gave a report of the same, and the motion was carried.

The Rev. Dr. Stables, as the proposer of the change, desired to state the reason for it. He felt that in offering this amendment he had brought before the Convention a most important subject, one affecting the peace and welfare of the Church, and the welfare of the world.

He had, however, by his report, but if prayers were not read to him to be read in public, he would refuse to read them, and take the consequences. He would rather be tried for disobedience than for heresy.

The Rev. Dr. Rogers of Texas moved to amend by making the examination committee to be appointed by the Bishop consist of one presbyter, with the chaplain, instead of two presbyters, as reported by the Committee.

The question was then put upon the canon as amended, and it was adopted.

The House then proceeded to select a place for the meeting of the next General Convention. After some discussion as to the fairest way of voting upon the question, a vote was taken, and Baltimore was chosen by a vote of 12 to 12, one more than a majority.

The House then took a recess of an hour.

After recess the Rev. Dr. Haight, from the Committee on Canons, to whom we had referred the report of the Rev. Dr. Sheldon, on the examination of candidates for the priesthood, gave a report of the same, and the motion was carried.

The Rev. Dr. Stables, as the proposer of the change, desired to state the reason for it. He felt that in offering this amendment he had brought before the Convention a most important subject, one affecting the peace and welfare of the Church, and the welfare of the world.

He had, however, by his report, but if prayers were not read to him to be read in public, he would refuse to read them, and take the consequences. He would rather be tried for disobedience than for heresy.

The Rev. Dr. Rogers of Texas moved to amend by making the examination committee to be appointed by the Bishop consist of one presbyter, with the chaplain, instead of two presbyters, as reported by the Committee.